The United States Need Not Surrender

By

P. G. WHITE

The Author Presents
a Frank Analysis of

THE "LEFT" MOVEMENT

THE "RIGHT" MOVEMENT

CONFUSION — WHO AND HOW!

AMERICANISM — ITS BIRTH, PHILOSOPHY AND ACHIEVEMENTS

REFORM IN THE REPUBLIC

WHO WILL SOLVE AMERICA'S PROBLEMS?

THE BACKGROUND OF THE "LEFT"

THE BACKGROUND OF THE "RIGHT"

THE WAY OUT

he United States Need Not Surrender

By P. G. White

MONG the multitude of decisions facing the American people is one which has only recently come to be stated in its bald terms. **It is this: Will America turn to the left e right?** Everywhere newsnd magazines are taking up economic and political anoutlining the programs of the sing camps; the man on the s himself facing a new dilemthe advocates of both exout abuse at each other across of a bewildered people.

erence is that there are only to go—that America must go the right toward Fascism-Nato the left toward Socialism-m. Nothing is said about a ice — the rebirth of Amer-ism. In fact, it is subtly pointed out that the plain road charted by our forefathers in setting up this government is so beset with obstacles and difficulties, as it proceeds through the years, that only the widest kind of detour to the right or to the left will enable us to reach any destination at all.

Does it not seem strange that this country, which has contributed more to the science of government than any other nation in the history of the world, should now be asked to consider seriously theories of government imported from abroad, theories of distinctly foreign extraction, born of the hatreds and emotions from a war that all but annihilated European civilization and left the peoples of Europe incapable of rational thought or sober action? And yet, that is precisely what we are being asked to do.

WHY CHANGE OUR BASIC LAW?

We are being asked to throw aside the experience gained through a hundred and fifty years of progress. We are being asked to give up the rights and privileges of American citizens and take on the rules and regulations under which Europeans have struggled and fought for centuries. We are being persuaded to make important and serious changes in a formula of government which has been the envy and admiration of free peoples everywhere.

All this we are being asked to do, for

The Author Presents
a Frank Analysis of

THE "LEFT" MOVEMENT

THE "RIGHT" MOVEMENT

CONFUSION — WHO AND HOW!

AMERICANISM — ITS BIRTH, PHILOSOPHY AND ACHIEVEMENTS

REFORM IN THE REPUBLIC

WHO WILL SOLVE AMERICA'S PROBLEMS?

THE BACKGROUND OF THE "LEFT"

THE BACKGROUND OF THE "RIGHT"

THE WAY OUT

E 39,691

The United States Need Not Surrender

By P. G. White

AMONG the multitude of decisions facing the American people is one which has only recently come to be stated in its bald terms. **It is this: Will America turn to the left or to the right?** Everywhere newspapers and magazines are taking up the cry; economic and political analysts are outlining the programs of the two opposing camps; the man on the street finds himself facing a new dilemma; while the advocates of both extremes shout abuse at each other across the heads of a bewildered people.

The inference is that there are only two ways to go—that America must go either to the right toward Fascism-Naziism or to the left toward Socialism-Communism. Nothing is said about a third choice — the rebirth of Americanism. In fact, it is subtly pointed out that the plain road charted by our forefathers in setting up this government is so beset with obstacles and difficulties, as it proceeds through the years, that only the widest kind of detour to the right or to the left will enable us to reach any destination at all.

Does it not seem strange that this country, which has contributed more to the science of government than any other nation in the history of the world, should now be asked to consider seriously theories of government imported from abroad, theories of distinctly foreign extraction, born of the hatreds and emotions from a war that all but annihilated European civilization and left the peoples of Europe incapable of rational thought or sober action? And yet, that is precisely what we are being asked to do.

WHY CHANGE OUR BASIC LAW?

We are being asked to throw aside the experience gained through a hundred and fifty years of progress. We are being asked to give up the rights and privileges of American citizens and take on the rules and regulations under which Europeans have struggled and fought for centuries. We are being persuaded to make important and serious changes in a formula of government which has been the envy and admiration of free peoples everywhere.

All this we are being asked to do, for

what reason? Because, they say, we are in a depression. **One would think to hear these self-appointed advisers that ours was a fair-weather form of government; that it had been devised by a group of happy and contented statesmen basking at ease in the bright sunshine of a faultless summer day, who neither knew nor expected anything but harmony and prosperity and eternal well-being.** So that now, when we have struck a tough spot we must work out an altogether new system, a new "plan" to fit "modern conditions." How utterly ridiculous such an idea is, and yet we have all been more or less guilty of absorbing this sort of propaganda.

We shall see, directly, the conditions under which our forefathers labored and what caused them to establish the kind of government they did, but first let us examine the two suggestions we are being offered. They are best illustrated by a circle, with Americanism at the top, center.

THE MOVEMENT TO THE LEFT

First, we'll look to the left. The movement to the left begins with those who maintain that the people do not have enough voice in the affairs of the government. They claim that two heads are better than one and that a thousand heads are better than ten. They would more and more refer every action of government to popular vote, forgetting the dangerous power of self-seeking demagogues to sway public emotions in the interests of vote-getting. They would have "the peepul" not only try to run the government by hand, but they would have them vote on the conduct of each others businesses in the name of the "public interest." They have a very important sounding name for this. They call it "economic planning," or they call it "public ownership and control."

Now public ownership and control, within limits, is a perfectly sound idea when mixed with a little American common sense. For instance, a post office, by its very nature, lends itself to government operation, although with an air-tight monopoly in our postal system we haven't done so well with it as a business proposition so far. Water works and power plants and street railways, under certain circumstances, have been operated to the benefit and profit of the community. A certain small city has owned and operated a coal mine successfully. A certain large city has run a railroad for thirty years and made money out of it. **But where success has followed these ventures the answer has lain in management on business lines and not political lines—the alderman's son and the supervisor's cousin have been left off the payrolls.** "Politics" accounts for the fact that there have been many more disappointments than successes, and for the further fact that, on the whole, the public ownership venture in this country has been a dismal, a total and a costly failure.

The public ownership fanatics would have us dive into this pool headlong, without having learned to swim, and with no one to throw us a life preserver if we sink. They would have public ownership of all the things they term "utilities," plus a "planned economy" of all businesses affecting the so-called "public interest." **They fail to tell us that from this point on there is no place to stop short of public ownership of all**

the means of production and public ownership of all private property. Such a plan then becomes Socialism.

But how is Socialism to be put into effect? Obviously, most people are going to be loathe to give up the property they have worked and saved to get, and any legal route by means of confiscatory laws will be long, tortuous and slow. And so we have believers in Socialism who insist that we must overthrow the existing economic system and existing governments and set up a "government of the mob, by the mob and for the mob" immediately. This is Communism. **Under Communism everybody owns everything and no one owns anything—and we find we have been led around the circle to the LEFT until we have reached a point exactly opposite where we started, and diametrically opposed to Americanism. This is the Socialist-Communist movement.**

THE MOVEMENT TO THE RIGHT

Now to the right. Those who would take us in the opposite direction—to the right from Americanism — have lost faith in representative government. They insist that both our economic system and our governmental structure have broken down, and that the answer lies in giving more powers to a central authority. Without exactly saying so, they advocate the theory that the farther you remove the source of power from the people, the more efficiently the people will be governed. They believe in giving the people not more power, but less power.

The more advanced among these agitators would tell us that only by means of absolute authority resting in a single individual can we ever hope to untangle our difficulties. **Such a program involves, not the elimination of private property as the Socialists advocate, but the absolute control of all private property for the benefit and glory of the state. The individual still holds title to his property, but he has to ask the government what he can do with it... Finally, the dictator doesn't even wait for him to ask, he just tells him.** During all this time the dictator keeps telling the individual that his "human rights" are not being disturbed, that only his property rights are being regimented. But the citizen soon finds out that without property rights his human rights have nothing to rest upon, that the "new freedom" is not freedom at all, but the saddest kind of confinement. **He has ambition without opportunity, will power without the means of exercising it.** He is bound to the state as firmly as the peasant of old was bound to the soil. This is Naziism, or Fascism, or Authoritarianism, and we find, when we travel this route, that we have been taken around the circle to the **RIGHT** until we have again reached a point diametrically opposed to Americanism.

THE TYRANNY OF DICTATORSHIP

Now let's look at our mental diagram, and we will observe that left wing Socialism-Communism and right wing Naziism-Fascism, the one representing a leftward swing and the other representing a rightward swing, now lie side by side on the opposite side of the circle from Americanism. When followed to their ultimate ends, they meet on a common ground of dictatorship. Both deny individual rights. **In one system the individual loses his property, in the other**

system he loses the right to control his property, but in both systems he loses the rights of person—the right of free speech, the right of assembly, the right to religious freedom, and the right to a liberal education. This is not Americanism, it is Europeanism, and why Americans fall for either one of the schemes is one of the wonders of our times.

Italy under the king did not know our kind of freedom, Italy under Mussolini does not know freedom; Germany under the Kaiser did not know American freedom, Germany under Hitler does not know freedom; Russia under the Czar did not know freedom, Russia under Stalin does not know freedom as we know it. In none of these countries, nor elsewhere in Europe, have the people or their leaders ever been able to set up a system that brought as much widespread happiness and prosperity as we have enjoyed in this country. Failing in their efforts at home, the advocates of European philosophies are now boring within our ranks, trying to persuade us to adopt what our fathers fled from when they came to these shores and set up a new kind of government.

CONFUSION REIGNS

If Noah Webster, the compiler of the dictionary, with all his learning and power of language, should come back to earth and should attempt to describe in one word the mental condition of the American people of today, that single descriptive term undoubtedly would be the word - **confusion.** A state of complete confusion exists everywhere, in every line of activity, in every avenue of thought. Wherever you go there is vacillation, there is uncertainty, there is wonderment. **People generally have cast loose from their anchorage and have become the victims of every wind that blows and every tide that turns. A new scheme is proposed, it is seized upon eagerly by distracted millions, carried to fantastic heights, exploded and dropped. The next day a cure-all appears over the horizon and becomes the rage; while below and behind all this confusion the sponsors of foreign schools of thought, knowingly or unknowingly, work their sinister plans to destroy the principles of the American system.**

Why all this confusion? Why is it that the normally sober American people have lost all sense of proportion and are either grasping at phantoms or are accepting the leadership of those who would destroy. The answer lies in the history of our social, religious and political organizations during recent times.

Millions of people have joined churches. The deep religious instinct in man impels him to seek union with his fellows in the worship of Deity, but there is another reason. He joins a church because there he finds a religious leader, an authority so-to-speak in religion, a person whose business it is to interpret God to man. The average individual, busy with the affairs of his daily life, looks to this leader for the answer to the age-old queries of the universe: Who is God? What is God? How can man so organize his life as to live in conformity with God's laws? To the extent and in proportion as people become active in their churches, they tend to look more and more to their religious leaders for guidance in the affairs of life, and to accept them as authorities in the things of the spirit and as exponents of the bet-

ter life. **Then one day they find their leader preaching a strange doctrine, a doctrine that leads away from the old truths, that denies the logic of established principles, that disturbs the foundations of politics and economics. And whether they are followers of Moses or of Christ, of Buddha or of Mohammed, the people are shocked and troubled — and become confused.**

Millions of men have joined fraternal organizations. They have joined to express their fellowship for one another and to learn from fraternal leaders the principles of the brotherhood of man. As they have become active in fraternity, they have come to look upon their fraternal leaders with respect and reverence, and to accept their leadership, not only in fraternal matters, but in the general affairs of life. In many instances the word of the leader has become law. But here again has come betrayal. **One day there comes from the head of the organization a new philosophy. It appears at first to be no more than a liberal interpretation of former ideals, but as it is expanded, it takes on strange and unfamiliar form. In the end it involves rejection of American doctrines and the acceptance of opposing philosophies. Coming from the leader to whom they have looked with veneration, the new ideas gain acceptance — but the followers are confused.**

Millions more have joined political organizations. In these organizations, or parties, they have hoped, in company with others of like mind, to express their beliefs in regard to government. They have chosen political leaders who professed deep insight into political philosophies, and have learned to follow them unquestioningly. **Then has come the time when, through ignorance, or selfish political purposes or direct intent, these leaders have taken their people on a detour. They have told them that the tried principles of government were outmoded, that there was an easy and a quick way to political and economic security, and they have led them away from the American system into strange philosophies. And the people have been confused.**

THE SLOW SAPPING OF AMERICAN PRINCIPLES

This has been going on since about the year 1900. Slowly, surely, the philosophies of Europe have been woven into our thinking, and slowly, and just as surely, the American system as founded by Washington and perpetuated by Lincoln has been undermined, until today the foundations of our economic system, our political system and our social system are quivering and quaking as does the earth before a threatened disaster of nature.

Do not misunderstand. Not all of our religious leaders, our fraternal leaders or our political leaders are guilty of a departure from American principles. But the sad part of it all is that the great majority, who still cling to American ideals, go unnoticed, while the ten percent or less who preach radicalism of one kind or another receive public attention and acclaim. A minister, of whatever creed, who preaches the gospel, who administers to the spiritual needs of his congregation, and who humbly seeks to interpret God to his people, may live a long life and never see his name in the papers. But let him preach a sermon advocating Socialism or Communism or

some other form of dictatorship in government, and the headlines scream his name across the continent. Once started, once they see their names in print, few are able to withstand the subtle appeal of notoriety. Jewish, Protestant and Roman Catholic people alike are today subjected to the rankest radicalism by formerly respected religious leaders who have betrayed and who are betraying their followers. **Father Coughlin (Foreign-born) of the Roman Catholic Church, Harry Ward (Foreign-born) of the Methodist Church, Cadman (Foreign-born) of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, Fosdick of the Baptist Church, Rabbi Wise (Foreign-born) and Rabbi Mann of the Jewish Synagogues—all, with others of their kind, are today found in the ranks of the enemies of Americanism. And, the people are confused.**

What is this American system of which we speak? A few days ago I received a letter from a friend of mine in which he told me he had just written to his father in commemoration of his eighty-first birthday. He said that as he wrote it a feeling of shame came over him, for he realized he was part of a great group of people forty years of age and under who had come to laugh at age and at old people. He pointed out that there was a time in the history of mankind when old men, because of the very fact of their age, were the leaders of their groups. They were looked up to with respect, admiration and awe. In them was represented years and decades of experience in living; they were the custodians of the accumulated wisdom of the tribe. Their word was law, not because they were physically able to enforce it, but because all the people recognized that their advice and counsel in regard to the practical affairs of mankind were beyond price. Their authority was the authority of knowledge, of experience and of wisdom.

THE POWER OF WISDOM AND AGE

Throughout all history old men, wise in years, have been called upon to save their people in times of stress and danger. When Rome was about to be destroyed by the barbarians and all seemed lost, the thoughts of the citizens turned to Cincinnatus, an old man, who had long since retired from public life. He was found far out in the country behind his plow. He returned to counsel his people, and Rome was saved.

At the end of the World War, who was leading Germany? — von Hindenburg, nearly seventy years of age. Who was leading France? — Clemenceau, in his sixties. Who was leading England? — Lloyd George, in his sixties. Were these men there because they were popular? No, not at all. They were there because among all the youth and virility of those countries, in a situation demanding unprecedented physical and mental vigor, no one else had been found in whom the people had confidence to lead them to victory. Younger men with new ideas had tried and failed, and in their extremity the people had instinctively turned to experience and to age.

But more than the laughter at age, we of this generation have come to laugh at established truths and age-old philosophies. Not actually, but figuratively we go to the window each morning, raise the curtain and look out, hoping against hope to see, what? A strong young man with new ideas, mounted on a white horse, who will say to us, "Come with

me and I will lead you out of your difficulties, out of the depression." We do not say it, but we secretly long for a Stalin, a Mussolini, a Hitler, who will rise up with an answer to all our problems and lead us to Utopia. **So soft have we become, and so confused have we become, that to such a man we are willing to turn over all our possessions and our last shred of individual liberty.**

OUR FIRST DEPRESSION

We are in a serious depression. But we once had a depression in this country that was far worse. Go back to a time five years after the close of the Revolutionary War. Money was worth two and one-half cents on the dollar. Congress had been chased by mobs out of Philadelphia; our credit was gone, we were the laughing stock of the world; great masses of the people actually wished a return under the rule of Great Britain. Trade and industry had vanished, social life was in disorder. All this Washington observed. He saw that unless something was done, the results of all the labors and hardships of the war would be lost. He called men into conference, other conferences followed, and out of them came the Constitution Convention.

A word is necessary here in regard to the men who composed this convention. There was not a man there because he was a "good fellow." Not a man there because he was rich or because he was poor, because he belonged to this or that church, because he belonged to the right veterans' association, because he did or did not belong to a fraternal group, or because he belonged to a certain political party. Every man was there because he was recognized and accepted as the outstanding student of the science of government in his district. George Washington had studied and written treatises on the governments of Rome and Greece; Madison was an authority on the governments of the ancients; others, including Hamilton, had made painstaking studies of the then existing governments of Europe. **All together they represented the most highly trained, the most skillful body of experts in the science of government that was ever assembled at one time in any country in any period of civilization.**

THE PENDULUM OF GOVERNMENT

What did they observe as they toiled in a locked room over a period of five months to create a new kind of government for the American colonies? For one thing, they observed that throughout all history government had swung like a pendulum between two widely separated extremes. At one extreme was monarchy, representing all that had so recently been hateful to them under British rule. Sooner or later monarchy became dictatorship; the government seized all the powers, the people had none. Time after time in history the people had risen up in revolt against this type of tyranny, had killed the king and his succession, had killed the nobility, and had utterly destroyed the system.

Then the pendulum invariably swung in the other direction. The people, in revolt and protest against the monarchy, seized authority, set up a pure democracy, and attempted to exercise **by direct action** all the powers hitherto the sole possession of the monarch. (The use here and hereafter of the word "democracy" and of the word "republic" has no

reference whatever to political parties; these words are used solely to characterize systems of government.) Under the monarchy the government had had all the power and the people none; under the democracy, or mobocracy, the people had all the power and the government none. In the great amphitheatres of Greece and Rome the citizens gathered together to listen to the harangue of their orators. Pleas were made, appeals to the emotion rather than to the reason, and at the end of the orations the people voted. They voted for all their officials, great and small, they voted on laws, they voted on resolutions, they sat in judgment in criminal proceedings.

DEMOCRACY — A FAILURE

Inevitably every democracy in history broke up in confusion. Under the emotional agitation of demagogues, partisan and impossible laws were passed, bedlam broke loose and the democracy, invariably short-lived, went down in a welter of bloodshed. Then came a new leader, a new demagogue who said, "Follow me." The people followed him, a new dictatorship was born out of which came a new line of monarchs, and the cycle was repeated. So back and forth went the pendulum, from the monarch to the mob, from the mob back again to the monarch.

All this the framers of the Constitution observed, and so they set about to do a stupendous, a momentous thing. They decided to set up a form of government which would halt the pendulum in the middle, at the center of its swing. They determined to establish for the first time in the history of the world a "golden mean" in government, a system that would protect the people from the government and the government from the people.

Another thing they observed, and that was that in all ages past the many, if they had a chance, would persecute, murder and despoil the few, and that the few, if they had the chance, would persecute, murder and despoil the many.

A NEW DEAL IN GOVERNMENT

With these two things in mind they began to write a formula for the government of this country. They established a department of the legislative, composed of **representatives** of the people, to create laws. They established a department of the executive to administer the laws created by the legislature. They established a department of the judicial to interpret the laws as administered by the executive and created by the legislative. The judiciary was to protect the executive from the legislative and the legislative from the executive, and still more important, was to protect the government from the people and the people from the government. Thus was created what became known as the three independent branches of our federal administration.

But there was a fourth element in this formula of government which was of supreme importance. They called it the rights of the individual. Here, for the first time, was set up the doctrine that the individual had unlimited rights to own property and unlimited rights to his person. Always before, governments, in and out of emergencies, had been able to seize the property of individuals and appropriate it for the use of the state, or they had seized the person of the individual and thrown him into prison at the whim of some one man. But here was

a government which had written into its basic law the fact that every man had a right to his property and every man had a right to his person.

PROPERTY AND PROGRESS

Because of this, because the fruits of his thinking and the fruits of his toil that became converted into property, were finally and legally his, man in this country began to think as he had never thought before. He began to think in terms of new inventions, of new comforts, of new conveniences; he thought in terms of new factories and new homes; he thought in terms of railroads and steamships and power plants and automobiles and radios. Man's age-long desire for independence was realized, and as a result initiative, ambition and resourcefulness soared to new heights. In the short period of a hundred years we went farther, we developed more wealth, we distributed it more widely, than had any other country in a thousand years. America became the Mecca of the world. Like a magnet, it drew liberty-loving men and women from every quarter of the globe, and for a good reason. It was not alone the natural resources that existed here. Equal resources had existed and do still exist in other parts of the world. The reason lay in the fact that here the individual was protected in the fruits of his labor. **If his brain produced an idea or his hands created new wealth, that idea or that wealth was his, and if anyone tried to take it away from him the entire resources of the government would be called out to protect him in his ownership.**

The government set up by this new formula they called a republic. In the Federalist papers, written to describe the Constitution, Madison and Jay and Hamilton went to great lengths to explain to the people of their time the dangers of a **democracy,** the instability of any government operating **by direct action.** What they set up was a government **by indirect action,** a representative government whereby the people should act through their elected agents, — in other words, a **republic.** Listen to the words of the great Hamilton as, in the Federalist papers, he expounds the principles of the new Constitution to the citizens of New York:

". . . . It may be concluded that a pure democracy, by which I mean a society consisting of a small number of citizens, who assemble and administer the government in person, can admit of no cure for the mischiefs of faction. A common passion or interest will, in almost every case, be felt by a majority of the whole; a communication and concert result from the form of government itself; and there is nothing to check the inducements to sacrifice the weaker party or an obnoxious individual. Hence it is that such democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths.

"A republic, by which I mean a government in which the scheme of representation takes place, opens a different prospect and promises the cure for which we are seeking."

He continually refers to the "points of difference between a democracy and a republic" and to the errors in thinking that arise in "the confounding of a republic with a democracy."

Later he repeats: "The true distinction between these forms was also adverted to on a former occasion. It is, that in a **democracy** the people meet and exercise the government in person; in a **republic** they assemble and administer it by their representatives and agents."

WHERE DID WE GO WRONG?

We wonder what is the matter with us now. We hear people saying that the overthrow of the present administration or the return of some former administration is the way out of our predicament. Nothing could be more untrue. **The active undermining of our republic began thirty odd years ago, and every administration since then has contributed to a greater or lesser extent to the destructive process. What we are witnessing now is the accumulation and the bringing to a head of evil and subversive influences that began their work of destruction three decades ago. The way out lies in a return to the American system, a return to the republic of the Constitution. Those deceivers who shout that to go back to the Constitution means backward progress are reminded that when the traveler has drifted off on a detour and has reached the end of a blind road, he must retrace his steps to the main highway before any forward progress is possible. He will find no shortcuts to his destination.**

They tell us that the Constitution is out-moded, that it is out of date, that it was all right for a few people in a little country stretched along the eastern seaboard, but that it is not suitable for a great country, with a hundred and thirty millions of people who have progressed into a highly developed industrial and mechanical age. They tell us that Washington and the other founders could not possibly have foreseen the America of today, and that because of that fact the Constitution they wrote should be entirely changed and the government "modernized."

There is a key to the science of language. In English it consists of the twenty-six letters of the alphabet. That key holds good whether employed in the simplest nursery rhyme or in the most learned technical document. Wherever English is spoken c-a-t always spells cat, and because that is true English-speaking people the world over can converse, can write and can read understandingly. **Would any one pretend to say that those who invented the alphabet could have forseen the millions of people employing it and the multitude of ways in which it would be used? Could they possibly have foreseen the typewriter, the printing press or the telephone?**

SHALL WE AMEND ARITHMETIC?

There is a key to the science of mathematics. It consists of the ten digits. Two and two are always four and twice four are always eight, whether used in adding the grocery bill or in computing advanced calculus. Could the inventors of the key to mathematics have foreseen the adding machine, the comptometer or the evolution of the fourth dimension? **What would we say to the professor who came to us saying that some of his pupils were having trouble with arithmetic and suggesting that we change or amend the laws of this science so the answers of his pupils would always be right?**

The musical scale is the key to the science of music, and whether it is used

in grand opera or in the notes of a bugle call, that scale always holds good. Without the scale no music could be written; with the scale appear harmonies that enchant the ear or martial strains that stir whole nations to deeds of valor. There is a key to the science of music.

As surely as God reigns in his heaven, the inspired men who wrote the Constitution of the United States hit upon the key to the science of government. **They discovered the basic principle upon which it is possible for man to get along with his fellows in mutual profit and friendliness.** They struck the note that sounded for civilization a "new deal" in government. Those who come to us now with persuasive tongues to tell us that the Constitution is out of date, are careful not to quote us the words of Hamilton and Madison in which those great political thinkers carefully explained to us that the principles incorporated in the Constitution of our republic are **basic** principles, that they were not written for a small country or a large country, for a simple social system or a complicated social system, but are fundamental concepts of government upon which any society, any civilization, can rest secure. They are careful not to quote the words of Gladstone, who declared that it is "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the hand of man."

WEAKENING THE STRUCTURE

For more than a hundred years, under this new deal in government, we prospered—until about the beginning of the present century. And then what happened? Clever and shortsighted men began gradually to attack the foundations of our republic. Gradually power was removed from local governments and concentrated in the central government. Gradually we began to turn from a government by indirect action to a government by direct action, from a republic toward a democracy, or mobocracy. Direct election of senators, the long ballot containing the names of dozens of insignificant office holders, and the initiative and referendum, played no inconsiderable part in this movement. **Constantly the cry was, "More voting by the voters," and along with this went the destruction of local government and a new dependence upon the government at Washington.** Federal railroad legislation has brought our railroads to the point of ruin, federal encroachment on state authority has progressed to the point where, as many writers have recently pointed out, the states are nothing more than different colored squares on the map.

Now, a so-called child labor amendment has been proposed, in spite of generally adequate state laws on the subject, putting within the control of the federal government the welfare and the future of every child in the nation up to eighteen years of age. Efforts are also being made to have a federal dictatorship over education, a national educational machine to regiment the thoughts and actions of the next generation. At present, because we have allowed local units of government to go bankrupt, we are eagerly accepting financial domination from Washington in the guise of relief. Let us take heed before we throw away the heritage of sound government handed down by our fathers. Let us beware lest in avoiding present economic difficulties we rush into new perils we know not of. **Let us by all means retain that system of checks and balances**

between the federal departments and between the central authority, the states and the people which has distinguished us from the empires of Europe.

REFORM IN THE REPUBLIC

In America today there is a great cry for reform. Reform is in the air; everything, they say, ought to be changed. The proposals that are being propagandized to the American people, ranging over the whole field of human activity—economic, political, monetary, educational, social, religious and psychic — vary from the sane and sensible to the utmost heights of the insane and idiotic. Certain reforms are in order, but I believe that the American people, eager as they are for the righting of past wrongs, are unwilling to burn down their house just to get rid of vermin. I believe they want to continue to live in a free country, and that they desire to make whatever economic and political changes appear necessary, well within the framework of the Constitution and the rights to person and property granted by that document to the individual.

In this spirit the following proposals of reform, suggested by a discussion of a similar subject by Julien Benda in Foreign Affairs, are submitted:

1. If the American republic is to be saved, American citizens must come to understand that economic difficulties and economic inequalities cannot be corrected by exchanging representative government for either right wing Fascism and Naziism or left wing Socialism and Communism.

Certain economic reforms must be made. The lawless two percent in each line of business should not be allowed to put our whole business system in an uproar. Honest business men — who constitute 98% of the total—must not allow themselves to be stampeded into unsound and unethical practices by a few cut-throats who see fit to prey upon the public. Doctors, bankers, merchants, manufacturers, real estate operators, labor unions, in fact every line of business and every profession was so stampeded into the use of unwise business methods during recent years. Because a few people gambled, everybody started gambling; because shysters offered seductive loans, everyone jumped headlong into debt; because some rascals started the ball rolling, thousands of honest operators were tempted into overmortgaging their properties; because shady bond houses issued worthless securities, many others grew careless; because racketeering was rampant, certain labor leaders succumbed to the temptation of enormous incomes from that practice. **The idiotic things that each of us did helped make up the grand total of idiocy. The remedy lies within business itself, not in an avalanche of bureaucratic regulations imposed by government.**

The danger at the moment is that subversive elements in the country, who would like to see our institutions overturned, are telling the people that our representative form of government has been responsible for all the evils of our business and economic system, that, in fact, the individual rights of owning property granted in our Constitution are responsible for the depression. They are telling us that in order to get rid of a few crooks in business we must give up our individual liberties, change or abolish our Constitution and go to some form of Socialism-Communism on the left or

Fascism-Naziism on the right. Millions of Americans have fallen under the spell of this seductive argument.

Economic reforms must be made, but that is decidedly not the most important thing to be done for the maintenance of American security. Particularly, these reforms must not involve the destruction of the very system under which we have heretofore prospered.

POLITICAL BLACK MAGIC

2. The second reform we must make is a reform in our political thinking. Our Constitution, in setting up the three great departments of government—legislative, executive and judicial — created a system of checks and balances by which on the one hand the people were protected in their individual rights from the evils of bureaucracy and dictatorship, and on the other hand, government was protected from the onslaught of unrestrained democracy, or mobocracy. Power was given to the representatives of the people in Congress for the purpose of protecting the people themselves from undue authority exercised by the executive branch of government. **But as it is now, congressmen do not protect their constituents from arbitrary acts of the executive; instead, they organize their constituents for the purpose of granting still further powers to the executive, in return for which these constituents are to get new favors in the way of jobs and grants of money.**

This system of "pork barrel" representation will not be easy to overcome, for the simple reason that, while the representatives of the people are using it to feather their own nests, they make it appear that it is not themselves but the people who benefit most from the system. Under promise of what seem to be special favors, great groups of citizens are constantly persuaded into making additional grants of power to government. This process, if continued, can have only one result — the people will have sold their birthright for a mess of "pork" pottage (temporary at best), and all their rights as individuals will have been bartered away. Only enlightened and thinking citizens can correct this evil, but no other reform is so important if we are to retain the American system.

This bartering away of fundamental rights for temporary favors is not confined to the individual citizen. Its demoralizing influence has spread to towns, counties, cities and to the states themselves . We have, accordingly, the absurd picture of state governors appearing, hat in hand, before federal executive appointees, offering unlimited state co-operation with federal bureaucratic policies in return for an additional chance at the national grab bag. Is this in keeping with the American spirit of individual and local initiative and independence? To what low, boot-licking depths have we fallen! What outlook is there for our liberties if those who have led us into this servile position continue to sell us their insidious propaganda?

If, with the acceptance of every federal favor, we must give up another right, then, as true Americans, we must rise up in our pride and refuse to accept favors on such a basis... As citizens under a free republic we must refuse to become a nation of dependents, and we must let our representatives know this, in order that they will barter away no more of our liberties. This is the second reform that must be made.

WHY "LET THEM SPOUT?"

3. The third reform necessary for the maintenance of the American Republic is some modification of our theory of extreme tolerance. Our idea of what constitutes a "free" country must undergo some revision. We must see to it that school teachers, for example, are not "free" either inside or outside the classroom to teach subversive doctrines. we must not allow our ideas of a "free" press to go so far as to permit the circulation of magazines and pamphlets advocating the overthrow of government. The "free" right of assembly must not include unlimited license to hold radical meetings in which known advocates of revolt whip their hearers into a frenzied zeal for the destruction of American institutions. A tolerant sense of false security must not lull us into an attitude of supine pacificism in the international field: Christian tolerance toward misguided individuals must not allow us to break down our domestic criminal laws through unwarranted extension of an already lenient parole system.

The first obligation of any government is self-preservation. Under the American Constitution, free speech, a free press and the right of assembly represent the foundations of individual liberty. Yet, some common sense in the administration of these liberties is necessary to prevent liberty from being turned into license... The enemies within our gates — the radical pacificists, the criminals, the pinks, the reds, the yellows, as well as the Fascist groups of the extreme right —are using the rights of free citizens in a free country as weapons for the destruction of both citizenship and the republic... This cannot continue if republican institutions are to survive.

The tremendous success achieved in this country under the Constitution over a period of a hundred years, and the natural pride of all Americans in this accomplishment, has had a most peculiar result. We have come to believe that we, as a nation, have been singled out as the object of a special Divine care, that Providence not only smiled on us at the time of our national birth, but has continued to guide our national welfare through all the years, and will in the future direct and safeguard our destinies for all time to come. In other words, that we have been set apart as a chosen nation, that we are immune to destruction both from within and from without, and that we can therefore afford to disregard even the simplest measures for our own protection.

If Providence smiled upon our Constitution, it was because it was written in harmony with the Great Laws of the Universe; if Providence smiled upon us during the first hundred years of our existence as a nation, it was because we continued to act in harmony with those laws. If, now, we allow the enemies of the republic to persuade us into strange paths, we shall perish, as have other great civilizations before us.

Representative government is inherently strong. By our policy of extending freedom of action to our enemies, we are making it inherently weak... A reshaping of our ideas of tolerance is the third and final reform which the American republic must make to save itself.

AMERICA'S "NATURAL PATRIOTS"

With these reforms in mind, and with some understanding of the methods by which confusion has been injected into orderly American thinking, the question next arises, Who can be depended upon to help us solve American problems in an American manner?

In this connection, the writer pleads guilty to some very strong convictions. After a very careful, and even prayerful study, after talking with hundreds of people, including the adherents of every popular "movement," in every strata of society, I have arrived at certain definite conclusions. In the first place, politically speaking, I favor a strong, an intense American nationalism. **I believe there are American solutions to American problems, and because of that fact I believe there are certain groups in this country who are naturally so constituted, or so influenced by outside forces, that they will be unable to go along with us on our program. These conclusions have been arrived at with no prejudices, no preconceived ideas, on the subject. If I can be accused of prejudice at all, it is of prejudice in favor of Americanism and the American system as set up under the Constitution of the United States.**

To begin with, I am convinced after study that the job of Americanizing America must be done by the native born. I know, and the reader will know, dozens, yes hundreds, of ardently loyal citizens who were born abroad. Many of them are among the best citizens of our republic. Individually they could be depended upon without reserve. But in groups of 500, or 5,000 or 5,000,000 they could not be expected to go all the way in a campaign of intense American nationalism. I am forty years of age. I might move to England and there become a citizen of the British Empire. I might learn to admire and respect the great British institutions and might develop a sincere loyalty to the British government and to the British ruler. But in a time of stress, in a particular crisis involving British nationalism as against American nationalism, I could be expected to waver. I could not help remembering the pleasant incidents that occurred during the first forty years of my life, in the United States of America.

If, under those circumstances, I should find myself part of a group of British subjects also born in America, my allegiance might well become divided, and I would hesitate. Therefore, I say that the native born of this country constitute the group who most naturally could be depended upon to support a campaign of strong nationalism. Children of the foreign-born, reared and educated in the atmosphere of American institutions, would, of course, naturally fall into the co-operating group.

Second, the work of Americanizing America must be done by the white race. Here, again, we all know individual members of the black race and other races who would stand steadfast through any national crisis. But I am convinced, as every other thinking man must be, that **as a group** the negro represents a lower degree of intelligence than does the white man. He tends to act from emotion, he is more easily led by demagoguery, and, in the mass he could not be expected to apply the same diligence to a campaign of intense American nationalism as could the native-born white man. Furthermore, I believe that the salvation of the negro lies in the com-

plete separation of the races. It has been proved time and time again that the meeting of the races on terms of social equality leads to indiscriminate intermarriage, and that the offspring of such unions frequently incorporate the worst qualities of both races.

Third, I believe that in a campaign for Americanizing America we must look to Gentiles for our support. The Jew, no matter how loyal to the country and the flag he may be as an individual, is a member of an international race. He tends to be a Jew first and an American second, a Jew first and an Englishman second, or a Jew first and a Frenchman second. Jews in any country form a state within a state, and these groups, joined as they are across national boundaries by ties of blood, race and religion, form an international brotherhood with an international viewpoint. Jewry as an institution is international in scope, international in thought and international in action. Regardless of the splendid loyalty of individual Jews toward American institutions, they could not be expected, when joined in groups of 500, or 5,000 or 5,000,000, to go all the way in a campaign for intense American nationalism.

Fourth, I believe that in looking for a group most naturally inclined toward intense American nationalism, the choice must fall upon Protestants. The patriotism of individual Roman Catholics cannot be questioned; thousands of them would suffer to the death for American ideals. But it cannot be forgotten that the Roman Catholic church has taken and does still take an active part in international politics. The Roman Catholic from the time of baptism becomes part of an international organization whose leadership is from Rome. The Roman Catholic church tends to place the edicts of the Pope above the laws of any country. It believes in religious dictatorship rather than in religious freedom and liberty of conscience for the individual. It stands to reason that, in a time of stress and the testing of allegiances, Roman Catholics, in groups of 500, or 5,000, or 5,000,000 could not be expected to follow unswervingly a campaign of intense American nationalism — a campaign of Americanizing America.

RIGHT OR LEFT

To return now to our original question, Will America go to the right or to the left?

The propaganda barrage that would take us to the left, toward Socialism and Communism, is coming, as all Americans are beginning to be aware, from Moscow, the Third International, and the Communist Soviet. But back of these is the philosophy of Karl Marx, the Jew, "Father of Socialism," and the support of a great international body of Jewish Socialist thinkers throughout the world. It was not by accident that four-fifths of the original Soviet commissars were of Jewish extraction. It is not by accident that the great majority of Socialist and Communist leaders in every country today are of that race. **The movement to the left is unmistakably connected with Jewry.**

It is not enough for wealthy and prominent Jews to deny giving support, financial and otherwise, to the left-wing radical movement that is attempting to destroy governments the world over. Their sincerity must remain in question until they say to us: "There are good Jews and bad Jews. We, the leaders of our people, denounce the Communist and

Socialist Jew as a dangerous Jew. We warn the world against him. We reject him because he fails to live up to the principles of our religion and the beliefs of our people."

No important group of Jews has made any such denunciation. To the contrary, we find hundreds of them openly giving support to the enemies of constituted government, and through their control of international finance secretly supplying funds for the growth of subversive movements. Only one conclusion is possible — that the aims and ideals so fluently talked about in Jewry are not always the aims and ideals of Americanism

On the other side of the picture, we find that Fascist-Nazi dictators throughout the world are, without exception, members of the Roman Catholic church. Mussolini of Italy, Hitler of Germany, Dolfuss and his successors of Austria, all hold allegiance to the Vatican.

THE STORY OF FASCISM

Some interesting details of the Fascist movement in recent years have escaped popular notice. In each of the three principal Fascist-Nazi countries — Italy, Germany and Austria — the series of events leading up to a dictatorship was identical. In each of them there was a serious threat of Communism, fostered by the Third International of Moscow and international Jewish influences. People became alarmed, especially the great middle classes, and in each case there arose a leader who said: "I, too, oppose Communism. Follow me, and I will destroy Communism. I, too, oppose the domination of wealth over the masses, the domination of big business over little business. I, too, denounce banks and financial leaders as thieves and robbers of the poor. Follow me, and I will organize a new system in finance and a new system in business that will protect the little fellow from the great corporations, that will protect the small merchant from the chain store magnates, that will insure to small depositors the safety of their savings, that will take the money changers out of the temple and end the money barons' domination of the government. The 'average man' has suffered from the greed of the rich and from the ambition of misleaders of labor. I will save you from both of them. **But, first, you must clothe me with the powers of a dictator."**

These powers being granted, or seized, the new leader proceeded to outlaw Communism-Socialism and drive it underground. He then threw the leaders of labor out of office and abolished the established labor unions. In their stead he set up new national associations of laboring men, controlled and dominated by the government. In Italy Mussolini boasts that the workman is not compelled to belong to the government union. Quite so. **The only fly in this ointment is that he must pay dues in it whether he belongs or not. In Germany jobs are given first to those who hold cards in the government union; if there are any jobs left, the others get them. In German factories every group of workmen is assigned a leader-boss who must be a member of the Nazi party, and who reports to the local Nazi leader.**

Having labor under control, the dictators then began to regiment industry and business. It must be remembered that during the growth of the Fascist-Nazi movements, business men both

large and small, were inclined to support the movements or at least keep silent and let them grow. They did this for a very definite reason. They were deathly afraid of Communism, and while the more informed among them realized that under Fascism they would be regimented and their property controlled for the benefit of the state, they preferred to chance this rather than suffer a Communist revolution which would take their property entirely away from them.

The dictator proceeded to dictate. He set up great government corporations for every line of business, with boards of directors on which government representatives sat and dictated some more. Every business man, no matter how small, was compelled to pay dues to the government corporation controlling his line of business. From government boards came rules, edicts, and regulations, control of what could be manufactured and when, what capital was to be employed and how — a vast regimentation that made every man the servant of the state. The dictator organized the "Corporative State," or the "Totalitarian State," or the "Christian Authoritarian State on a Corporative Basis." **When it was all over, he had saved the people from Communism on the left, but he had taken them straight over to Fascism on the right. And the middle classes, to whom he had come with his false promises, found themselves thrust aside, forgotten and ignored.**

Thus was a Fascist, Roman Catholic dictatorship established in Italy, in Germany and in Austria. In Italy and Austria the country was already majority Roman Catholic; in Germany the dictatorship was established over a predominantly Protestant nation. Roman Catholicism co-operates with Fascist dictatorships throughout the world. The two philosophies are identical in application—both rule by means of dictatorship imposed from above.

THE TEST IS COMING

The great danger in America today is that, in avoiding Communism on the left, we shall be led, willingly or unwillingly, to a Fascist dictatorship on the right. In this connection, the campaign of Father Coughlin, the radical radio priest of the Roman Catholic church, born in another country, foreigner by training, propagating a foreign philosophy taken from the Encyclicals of the Popes and expressed in the platform of the National Union for Social Justice, will be watched by informed Americans with great interest.

The United States, in avoiding Jewish-Communist dictatorship on the left, must not fall into Roman Catholic-Fascist dictatorship on the right. The United States need not surrender to either of these doctrines.

The answer to the question, Will America go to the right or to the left? is—**neither.** Both the radicalism of the left and the radicalism of the right are European in origin and international in purpose and significance; both aim to reduce American standards to world levels. The native, white, Gentile, Protestant stock of this country may well view with abhorrence the subtle activity of any group, right or left, religious, civil or financial, who would destroy the American system with foreign philosophies.

The revival of American security and the hope of a free civilization lies in a renewal of faith in those principles of

government under which we became a great nation — a campaign of intense American Constitutional nationalism.

American Constitutional nationalism, the author wishes to make plain, does not mean a dictatorship by the native, white, Gentile, Protestant group of citizens. Neither does it mean a majority rule by this group as would be the case if this government was that of a pure "democracy". Let every fair-minded citizen regardless of race, color or creed, understand that this American Constitutional nationalism guarantees to him equality under the law in his right of person (religious liberty, freedom of speech and assembly), right of property and inheritance (which means just rewards for his creative ability, whether by the sweat of his brow, as in labor, or mental effort as in the arts, professions or financial fields of endeavor). It does mean, however, that a citizen of any group is only entitled to these guarantees so long as he is law-abiding and upholds the form of government that cradles him, that to advocate the destruction of the American form of government is treason and should disfranchise him.

Let every citizen sincerely interested in the preservation of these rights of person and of property, which he holds sacred, study the plan for our Constitutional Republic, as has the author, and he will agree with one of the founding fathers, James Madison, that **"It is evident that no other form of government, than that of a Republic, would be reconcilable with the genius of the American people."**

Note: When this booklet has served your purpose the author suggests that you hand it to a friend.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THIS PAMPHLET
MAY BE OBTAINED BY ADDRESSING

P. G. WHITE
P. O. Box 225
Elgin, Ill.

1 copy	10 cents	—postage prepaid
3 copies	25 cents	—postage prepaid
8 copies	50 cents	—postage prepaid
20 copies	$1.00	—postage prepaid

Stamps, Currency, Money Orders, Etc., Acceptable.
Do not send personal checks.

ORDER BLANK

P. G. WHITE,
Post Office Box 225,
Elgin, Illinois

Attached find money order / currency / stamps in the sum of $.....

For which send me .....copies of **THE UNITED STATES NEED NOT SURRENDER,** by P. G. White.

.....
Name

.....
R. R., P. O. or Street

.....
City or Town

.....
State

PRICES

1 copy 10c
3 copies 25c
8 copies 50c
20 copies $1.00

ORDER BLANK

P. G. WHITE,
Post Office Box 225,
Elgin, Illinois

Attached find currency money order in the sum of $.....
stamps

For which send me ..... copies of **THE UNITED STATES NEED NOT SURRENDER**, by P. G. White.

.....
Name

.....
R. R., P. O. or Street

.....
City or Town

.....
State

PRICES

1 copy 10c
3 copies 25c
8 copies 50c
20 copies $1.00

[Rare]
E
743
W545
1934
01 0001 0133 9520